Proposals for the development of 21 of the more important incomplete middle schools, out of funds saved by the reduction of 55 of the less important or languishing incomplete middle schools which were sanctioned in the beginning of 1928-29 have been permitted by Government to be given effect to from June 1930 with certain modifications.

(*b*) None.

(*c*) Six (in Kadur District) may be taken as abolished as they were developed.

(*d*) The State grant for 1928-29 amounts to Rs. 40,06,100 and the total expenditure under State grant in 1928-29 was Rs. 40,08,000. There is no lapse under State grant but an excess expenditure of about Rs. 2,000.

Under Education Cess proper, there was a lapse of Rs. 1,76,000 against a Budget provision of Rs. 7,30,500 under the following heads:—

	Budget Provision	Amount spent	Amount lapsed
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Establishment	4,85,500	4,28,500	57,000
Buildings	1,20,000	67,000	53,000
Building grants ..	30,000	5,000	25,000
Equipment	95,000	54,000	41,000
Total ..	7,30,500	5,54,500	1,76,000

MESSRS. N. GURULINGAPPA and J. SIVARUDRAPPA (Honnali Taluk), A. S. MURIGAPPA and PATEL BASAPPA (Shimoga Taluk), BASETTAPPA (Channagiri Taluk), B. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA (Sagar Taluk) and N. BHASKARA RAO (Sorab Taluk).—

Q.—17. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) What was the amount placed at the disposal of the Director of Industries and Commerce for 1928-29, for providing loans to applicants for machinery and working capital ?

(*b*) What was the number of applications received during the year by the Director for the same ?

(*c*) What were the number and amount of loans sanctioned ? Also what are the different kinds of loans canstioned by him ?

(*d*) How many such applications were rejected and how many are pending ?

(*e*) Is it not possible to provide loans for all the pending applications at once or to give an endorsement within a reasonable time ?

(*f*) What was the amount allowed to lapse during the year ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENTS.—

A.—17. (*a*) No amount was placed at the disposal of the Director for this purpose. The provision in the Budget for the grant of loans for this year was Rupees one lakh.

(*b*) *Vide* statement attached. (*Vide* Appendix K.)

(*c*) *Vide* statement attached. (*Vide* Appendix L.)

(*d*) The total number of applications rejected or withdrawn amount to 86 as per Statement attached and the number now pending are 26, *Vide* statement. (*Vide* Appendix M.)

(*e*) It is not possible to sanction loans for all pending applications at once as enquiries have to be made of the solvency of the individuals, suitability of the security offered by them and the prospects of the industrial installation proposed to be erected.

Endorsements are given ta parties as soon as possible after enquiries on these points are completed.

(*f*) Loans were sanctioned to an aggregate amount of Rs. 79,116-8-0. Out of the balance a sum of Rs. 5,000 was sanctioned as working advance towards the Badanval Centre. The sum that lapsed out of the Budget grant was Rs. 15,883-8-0.

MESSRS. B. GOPALACHAR, KATTE DAKAPPA and TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA (Tirthalli Taluk).—

Q.—19. Will the Government be pleased to state the following:—

(*a*) How many State Fund roads are there in the State and what is their distance?

(*b*) What is the mileage grant with regard to each of these roads?

(*c*) What is the reason for some of them being very bad and some in good condition?